Asset Profile Overview

Purpose

This section of the report contains the Asset Profile, which is an overview or summary of existing conditions and issues within Cluster 1. This profile lays the foundation for the following sections of this report by establishing a context for understanding the community visions and reinvestment recommendations that flow from the data collection phase of the CRS process. The Asset Profile brings together information from a wide range of sources to paint a portrait of the Cluster, placing special emphasis on six key planning areas—housing, neighborhood commercial, transportation, jobs, environment and youth development. This profile is also intended to provide data useful to future planning efforts within the Cluster.

Data Sources and Methodology

Following is a brief summary of the data sources and methodologies involved in compiling the Asset Profile:

❖ Cluster Board Input

Cluster 1's 17-member Cluster Board provided information on developments, issues and resources within the sector through four subcommittees: housing, neighborhood commercial, transportation/jobs/environment and youth development. As community residents and representatives of various community-based organizations, members of the Cluster Board helped to "fill in the gaps" by providing information that might otherwise be overlooked in this fast-paced planning process. Some Cluster Board members also participated as data gatherers in the survey of residential and commercial building conditions.

❖ Inventory of Existing Conditions

A variety of data sources were tapped to develop an inventory of existing conditions within the Cluster. Chief among theses sources was Wayne State University's Michigan Metropolitan Information Center (MIMIC). MIMIC provided census and other data, as well as related maps which help to describe various aspects of Cluster 1. Additional information on existing conditions was also obtained through the City of Detroit's Planning and Development Department, CRS core staff and the Cluster 1 technical assistance team.

❖ Survey of Building Conditions

Cluster 1 Board members and residents were trained to conduct surveys of housing and commercial building conditions within the sector. Approximately 32 residents and Cluster Board members participated as data gatherers and collected data on over 148 housing census block groups and 907 commercial block fronts. Six youth planners also made a significant contribution to the collection and entry of survey data. The surveys classified housing and commercial building conditions according to the following scale:

- Reinforce: Stable Condition/Minor Repair
- Revitalize: Beginning to Show Signs of Decline
- Revitalize: Showing More Advanced Signs of Decline
- Restructure: Major Deterioration

Results from the surveys were mapped and the information provided critical, up-to-date planning information on the status of Cluster housing and commercial structures.

❖ Focus Groups & Surveys

Community stakeholders including residents, business owners and Cluster-based institutions and organizations were provided direct input into the CRS planning process through a series of Instrumented Group Interviews (IGI)—basically a modified focus-group format that includes a written survey. The IGIs were designed to provide Cluster stakeholders with an opportunity to provide input through written surveys and facilitated group discussions.

Four workshops were widely publicized and conducted in the areas of housing, neighborhood commercial, transportation/jobs/environment, and youth development. Approximately 75 community stakeholders participated in the focus groups and provided insight into the key assets, issues and challenges facing the Cluster. Participants also indicated their location preferences for housing and commercial developments as part of the housing and neighborhood commercial focus groups. A special breakout group for young people was also included as part of the youth development focus group.

❖ Review of Community Planning Activities

The CRS planning process was designed to build upon existing and proposed development plans and activities. Therefore, as part of the data collection phase and throughout much of the CRS process Cluster Board members, interested community stakeholders and the technical assistance team incorporated information from existing community-based plans and activities. These plans and activities are reflected in the Asset Profile and Reinvestment Recommendation sections of this report.

Existing Land Use Profile

The Cluster has a range of existing uses, including residential, commercial and industrial. Map 2, which is a generalized land use map, provides information about the location of different land uses in the Cluster.

Residential Uses

Land use in Cluster 1 is predominately residential, characterized primarily by single-family homes. There are a number of duplexes and small apartment buildings scattered throughout the Cluster. A small number of large garden style apartment complexes are located in the northeast area of the Cluster near the intersection of Seven Mile Road and East Outer Drive.

Open Space and Recreational Uses

The Cluster generally has few large open space areas and limited recreational opportunities. The largest open space areas in the Cluster are the Michigan State Fair Grounds, located in the far north-west edge of the Cluster, and Forest Lawn Cemetery, which is located in the center of the Cluster. There are three other smaller cemeteries in the Cluster: Congregation B'nai David; Gethsemane; and Sacred Heart of Saint Mary Cemeteries. Mount Olivet, a large cemetery located just outside of the eastern border of the Cluster, also provides a sense of open space in the Cluster.

There are forty-two parks in the Cluster. Most of the parks are small neighborhood parks (less than four acres) that offer no or very limited amenities. The larger parks in the Cluster include, Jayne Playfield and Recreation Center, Lipke Playground and Recreation Center, Farwell Filed, Butler and Dorias Playfields, and Krainz Playground. Generally the parks and recreational areas are spread throughout the north and central part of the Cluster.

Institutional Uses

The major institutional uses in the Cluster include, St. John's/Holy Cross Hospital, Pershing High School, Davis Aeronautical High School, the Detroit City Airport, the Michigan State Fair Grounds, the North-east Pumping Station and the Mound/Ryan Correctional Facilities.

There are a number of other institutional uses in the Cluster, including at least 170 churches and 33 elementary and middle schools.

Commercial Uses

Commercial corridors in Cluster 1 generally run along the east-west arterials of Seven Mile and Eight Mile, and along the north-south thoroughfares such as Van Dyke, Conant and Woodward. Other north-south roads, such as Mound, include residential, commercial and industrial uses.

There are three large (greater than 150,000 square feet) commercial shopping centers located in the Cluster. All of them, Bel Air Centre, Belmont Shopping Center and the Kmart Plaza II, are located in the northeast and north central parts of the Cluster.

Industrial Uses

Industrial uses are spread throughout the Cluster, however, they are generally located along the Mt. Elliott industrial corridor, which runs north-south through the Cluster and generally extend east to Sherwood. A number of areas in the southern portion of the Cluster also have significant industrial development. These include the areas west of the City Airport, between Grinnell and Lynch Road extending from French Road to Mt. Elliott, and scattered areas along I-75. There are also two Chrysler plants, both off of East Outer Drive, one at Mound Road, the other on Conner Avenue. Map 3 shows the boundaries of the Cluster's two Renaissance Zones and the portion of the Empowerment Zone that is in the Cluster.

Vacant and Surplus Land

Cluster 1 has significant amounts of vacant residential, commercial and industrial land particularly in the southeastern region of the Cluster. Map 4 shows the percentage of vacant land in 1996, by 1980 census tract boundaries. As Map 5 shows many of these vacant parcels are owned by the City.

Special Uses

Three areas in the Cluster are considered "special uses". They are: Detroit City Airport; the Michigan State Fair Grounds; and the Mound/Ryan Corrections Facilities.

Zoning Narrative

Residential Zoning

Cluster 1 is predominately zoned R1 (Single-Family Residential District), although there are also a number of R2 (Two-Family Residential District) areas in the Cluster. The R2 areas are generally located in the southern area of the Cluster (south of Harper between Conner and Van Dyke and south of Huber between Van Dyke and Mt. Elliott) and in small areas in the northern end of the Cluster (between Eight Mile and Nevada from Van Dyke to Sherwood and from Eight Mile to McNichols between Woodward and I-75). A few small areas are zoned R3 (Low-Density Residential District), R4 (Thoroughfare Residential District) or R5 (Medium-Density Residential District).

Commercial Zoning

There is a large amount of commercially zoned land in the Cluster, most of it zoned B4 (General Business District). The B4 areas run the length of north-south thoroughfares such as Van Dyke, Mound, Conant and Woodward, and east-west arterials such as Eight Mile, Seven Mile, McNichols and Harper, as well as Gratiot. There are a few small areas in the Cluster that are zoned B2 (Local Business and Residential District).

Industrial Zoning

Large areas of the Cluster are zoned M4 (Intensive Industrial District). These areas are primarily located along the Mt. Elliott industrial corridor, the areas bordering I-75 and the areas southwest of the Detroit City Airport. In general, M4 parcels are buffered from residential areas by a narrow band of M2 (Restricted Industrial District) or B4 (General Business District) zoned land. However, in many areas of the Cluster parcels zoned M4 are immediately adjacent to areas zoned R2 or R1.

Parks and Open Space

While there are a number of parks in the Cluster, no areas are specifically zoned as PR (Parks and Recreation).

Zoning Issues

There are a number of areas where R1 and R2 residential areas are directly adjacent to areas zoned M4 industrial. This is particularly true along much of the Mt. Elliott industrial corridor, especially in areas south of Lynch Road. This inappropriate zoning is also found in the northeast edge of the Cluster, southeast of the Eight Mile/Van Dyke intersection and along the Grand Trunk Western (GTW) railroad.

The commercial areas in the Cluster are predominately zoned B4 (General Business District) although many of these areas primarily serve local shoppers. Much of the commercial area in the Cluster could be rezoned to B2 to encourage the development of more appropriate commercial uses in consolidated neighborhood-based commercial centers and mixed use developments. Other areas that are currently zoned B4, but are vacant and unlikely to return to commercial use, could be used to support new institutional uses or be rezoned as PR (Parks and Recreation) to increase the amount of maintained open space and greenways in the Cluster.

Socio-Economic Profile

This section provides an overview of Clusters 1's socio-economic characteristics. The data comes primarily from the 1990 U.S. Census and, therefore, cannot provide an accurate up-to-date portrayal of the Cluster. However, while Cluster 1 has undergone numerous changes over the past seven years, the data included in this section will help to provide a framework for understanding the assets, issues and challenges facing the Cluster.

Following is a brief analysis of key socio-economic features of the Cluster. This analysis includes a comparison of Cluster 1 socio-economic characteristics with the City as a whole, as well as *within* Cluster comparisons (Table 1). Socio-economic variations within the Cluster will be examined based upon "Subcommunity" data—that is, the six Subcommunities that comprise Cluster 1: Airport, Davison, Grant, Nolan, Pershing and State Fair (Map 6). Finally, in some instances, socio-economic data from surrounding communities is also provided to establish a context for understanding how both the Cluster and City fit within the regional landscape. The tables that follow this analysis provide additional data on the Cluster, the City and Subcommunity or *within* Cluster variations.

Racial and Ethnic Characteristics

As of 1990, Cluster 1 had a total population of 108,634 as shown in Map 7. Census data on population including racial and ethnic characteristics depicts Cluster 1 as being virtually identical to Detroit in terms of population composition. For example, approximately 21% of Cluster 1's total population are white and 77% black, which mirrors the City's racial composition. What the data do *not* reflect, however, is a large, distinct Arab and Chaldean population. Estimates from the 1990 census indicate that approximately 30% of the population in one census tract and 39% of another census tract in Cluster 1 are either Arab or Chaldean. This is a unique feature of the Cluster that distinguishes it from the remainder of the city despite the apparent similarities reflected in the data.

Household Income

Household income is a socio-economic feature of the Cluster that is striking *not* because it stands in contrast to the city overall, but because it represents significant challenges for the Cluster. As Table 2 illustrates, the city of Detroit and Cluster 1 are very similar, for example, in terms of household income. The same holds true for persons living below the poverty line, which is 32% for the city and 37% for the Cluster. However, *within* the Cluster there is again considerable variation. As indicated in the Table, the median household income for the Cluster is $16,898 and ranges from $10,800 in the State Fair Subcommunity to over $23,000 in the Grant and Pershing Subcommunities. Map 8 reflects the median household income for the Cluster by census tract.The gap widens even more when comparisons are made across the region. Median household income, for instance, in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties is $27,997, $43,407 and $38,931 respectively.

Educational Attainment

While similar to Detroit along racial and household income lines, Cluster 1 differs from the City in terms of educational characteristics. For example, 45% of Cluster 1 residents did not complete high school compared with 38% of Detroit residents. Further, the gap between Cluster residents and the city widens considerably at the college level where approximately 22% of Cluster 1 residents have received *some* education at the college level, compared with 35% of all Detroit residents. There is also considerable variation within the Cluster in the area of educational attainment. The proportion of residents completing high school ranges from 22% in the State Fair Subcommunity to 32% in the Pershing Subcommunity. As might be expected, the data described here have implications for the Cluster—particularly with respect to employment— which are addressed more fully in the Job Centers and Youth Development sections of this report.

Housing

Map 9 shows the percentage of occupied housing units without automobile access. In terms of housing occupancy, Cluster 1 compares favorably with the City, where approximately 93% of the Cluster's 39,451 housing units are occupied compared with a 91% occupancy rate for the City as a whole. The proportion of owner-occupied housing units is also higher in Cluster 1 (60%) than in Detroit overall (53%). Across the region in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties the owner-occupancy rates are approximately 62%, 74%, and 77% respectively.

Median housing values, however, are significantly higher for Detroit ($25,600) than for the Cluster, ($19,900). *Within* Cluster 1 median housing values range from $14,234 in the State Fair Subcommunity to over $24,000 in the Grant Subcommunity. Perhaps not surprisingly, housing values are significantly higher for the region. Owner-occupied median housing values for Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties are $48,500, $95,400 and $76,800 respectively.

Occupational Characteristics

In terms of occupational characteristics, Cluster 1 is very similar to the City of Detroit as a whole. However, although the Cluster and City appear to be similar in terms of occupational characteristics, recent data on *business establishments by industry* [1] illustrates significant differences between Cluster 1 and Detroit as a whole in several ways. For instance, approximately 19% of the business establishments in the Cluster are within the manufacturing industry, as compared with only 9% for the city as a whole. Also, 27% of the business establishments in Cluster 1 versus 38% of the business establishments in the city are in the service industry. These and other employment-related characteristics will be examined further in the Job Centers section of this report, particularly as they relate to identifying potential job center opportunities.

Crime

Finally, one critical quality of life issue that has not been addressed as part of this profile, yet touches virtually every area of this report is crime. As might be expected, the crime rate poses a challenge for Cluster 1 as it does throughout much of the City. Frequently, however, there is a difference between *actual* crime and the *perception* of crime, and both can have a significant impact on quality-of-life as will be illustrated throughout this report.

In terms of total crimes (which include all reported homicides, rapes, robberies, assaults, burglaries, larcenies and auto thefts), 1996 City of Detroit crime maps by squad car area (Map 10) and data from the 1996 Uniform Crime Reports indicate that Cluster 1 crime is very similar to crime for the City as a whole. However, the map reflects total crimes for each of the City's squad car areas and does not account for differences in population size.

As the map illustrates, unlike some areas of the City, all of the squad car areas in Cluster 1show fewer than 1,500 total crimes for 1996. The majority of the squad car areas within the Cluster show total crimes of 500 to 999—the second lowest total crime category. In fact, only *three* of the Cluster's 16 squad car areas show total crimes in the 1,000 to 1,499 range. There was a total of 13,016 crimes for the entire Cluster in 1996 which translates to approximately 120 crimes per 1,000 residents compared with approximately 117 crimes per 1,000 residents for the entire City. The following table further illustrates how crime in Cluster 1 compares with Detroit overall.

Table 3: Cluster 1/City of Detroit Crime Data

1996 Crimes per 1,000	Cluster 1	Detroit
Total Crimes	119.82	116.92
Homicide	0.52	0.42
Rape	1.09	1.09
Aggravated Assault	10.95	10.95
Robbery	9.08	9.25
Auto Theft	37.45	33.33

Generally speaking, Detroit has experienced a downward trend in crime in recent years. Property crime, for example, has declined steadily between 1984 and 1990 and has remained fairly stable since 1990. Violent crime peaked in 1983 and has declined in 1994 through 1996 (Wayne State University, Center for Urban Studies Urban Safety Program, Crime in Metropolitan Detroit, May 1997). In fact, Uniform Crime Report data indicates that, with the exception of arson, rape and auto theft, reported crimes in *all* other categories have dropped again from 1995 levels in Detroit. This is not to suggest that crime is not an issue for Cluster residents, but that considering some of the views expressed during the focus groups and in surveys, the perception in some instances may be worse than reality.

Summary of Key Socio-Economic Characteristics & Issues

Characteristics and Issues
❖ Racially, ethnically diverse neighborhoods
❖ High home ownership rates (60%)
❖ Relatively higher overall socio-economic status in Grant, Perhshing and Nolan sub-communities than in Airport, Davison, State Fair and in some instances, City-wide
❖ Relatively large population of young people under 18 years (32%)
❖ High proportion of manufacturing business establishments
❖ High proportion of residents who have not completed high school
❖ High poverty rate

1 Information provided by Michigan Metropolitan Information Center. Data Source, Michigan Employment Security Agency/SEMCOG, 1994.

Table 1: Cluster 1 Subcommunity Socio-Economic Data

	Airport	Davison	Grant	Nolan	Pershing	State Fair
Median HH Income	$11,860	$14,457	$23,537	$17,222	$23,570	$10,860
Persons Below Poverty	48%	41%	26%	26%	24%	52%
High School Grads/GED	27%	29%	29%	31%	32%	22%
Owner Occupied Housing	52%	59%	66%	63%	74%	36%
Median Housing Value	$16,750	$14,309	$24,230	$19,735	$23,700	$14,234

Table 2: Cluster 1/City of Detroit Summarized Socio-Economic Characteristics

Population & Households	**Cluster 1**	**Detroit**
Total population	108,634	1,027,974
❖ White, non-Hispanic	21%	21%
❖ Black, non-Hispanic	77%	76%
❖ Other, non-Hispanic	<2%	<2%
❖ Hispanic	1%	3%
Household Structure		
Total households	36,785	374,057
Female householder, no husband	34%	27%
Household Income		
Less than $5,000	16%	16%
$5,000 to $9,999	19%	16%
$10,000 to $14,999	12%	11%
$15,000 to $24,999	18%	16%
$25,000 to $34,999	12%	13%
$35,000 to $49,999	13%	14%
$50,000 to $74,999	8%	10%
$75,000 to $99,999	2%	3%
$100,000 and over	<1%	1%
Median Household Income	$16,898	$25,600
Poverty Status		
Persons below poverty	37%	32%
Age Structure		
Under 18 years	32%	29%
18 to 64 years	60%	59%
65 years and over	8%	12%
Educational Attainment		
Less than 9th grade	15%	12%
1 to 3 years of high school	30%	26%
High school graduate or GED	29%	28%
1 to 3 years of college	17%	25%
College graduate or higher	5%	10%

Table 2: (Continued)
Cluster 1/ City of Detroit Summarized Socio-Economic Characteristics

Occupation	**Cluster 1**	**Detroit**
Managers and professionals	14%	19%
Technicians	3%	3%
Sales and administrative support	28%	28%
Farming, forestry and fishing	<1%	1%
Services	17%	20%
Precision production, craft and repair	<1%	9%
Mach. operators, assemblers, inspectors	15%	12%
Laborers	10%	9%
Class of Worker		
Private, for-profit	75%	69%
Private, not-for-profit	6%	8%
Local, State, Federal government	17%	20%
Self-employed	2%	3%
Unpaid family	<1%	<1%
Housing Occupancy		
Total Housing Units	39,451	410,027
Occupied Units	93%	91%
❖ Owner-Occupied Units	60%	53%
❖ Renter-Occupied Units	40%	47%
Vacant Housing Units	7%	9%
Value of Owner-Occupied Units		
Less than $15,000	32%	20%
$15,000 to $24,999	36%	28%
$25,000 to $49,999	29%	42%
$50,000 to $99,999	3%	9%
$100,000 or more	< 1%	1%
Automobile Availability		
No vehicle	34%	33%
One	40%	39%
Two	20%	21%
Three or more	7%	7%